

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

Quarmaine Marquise Jones,	)	Case No. 4:24-cv-03133-DCC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>ORDER</b>
	)	
South Carolina Department of	)	
Corrections, Willie Eagerton, Mr. West,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	
<hr style="width: 40%; margin-left: 0;"/>	)	

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's amended complaint alleging violations of his civil rights. ECF No. 14. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III, for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On July 25, 2024, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that this action be dismissed with prejudice, without issuance and service of process, and without leave to amend. ECF No. 19. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences for failing to do so. Plaintiff has not filed objections to the Report and the time to do so has lapsed.

**APPLICABLE LAW AND ANALYSIS**

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final

determination remains with the Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” (citation omitted)).

After considering the record in this case, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge, the Court finds no clear error and adopts the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. Accordingly, this action is **DISMISSED** with prejudice, without issuance and service of process, and without leave to amend.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Donald C. Coggins, Jr.  
United States District Judge

October 29, 2024  
Spartanburg, South Carolina